

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 11/03/2010 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). Claims 5-11 and 14-21 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is thanked for the same.

By virtue of this paper, claims 1, 6-9, 12-13, 15-16 and 21 are sought to be amended and claims 2-5 and 14 are sought to be canceled. The amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer. The amendments are believed not to introduce new matter and their entry is requested. Claims 1, 6-13 and 15-21 are thus presented for reconsideration further in view of the below remarks.

Communication with Examiner

The Examiner was sent a copy of the proposed response and it was indicated that the response appears to be fully responsive to the Outstanding Office Action. The applicant is believed to have met any burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

The Examiner is thanked for acknowledging and making of record the IDS filed on 05 May 2006.

Specification

In page 2, paragraph 1 of the Outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to stating:

On page 3, lines 10-12, "the first module may further send an address ..., wherein the data is sent.... in the data transfer phase" is apparently confusing in that sending an address in an address transfer phase apparently should be described in place of sending data in a data transfer phase, which would also consistent with the first paragraph of the overview.

In response, the corresponding paragraph 0023 is sought to be amended to clarify that **the same first module** (which has earlier sent the address to the second module) also sends the data bits to the second module in the data transfer phase.

Withdrawal of the objection with respect to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating:

5 In claim 1: "using a first set of signal lines" is
considered vague in the context of the detailed disclosure
and apparently should be "using all of a first set of
signal lines"; "using said first set of signal lines" is
10 considered vague in the context of the detailed disclosure
and apparently should be "using all of said first set of
signal lines".

Claim 1 is sought to be amended accordingly. Withdrawal of the rejection as against
claim 1 is respectfully requested.

15 Claim 3 was also rejected based on 35 U.S.C. § 112. The rejection is rendered moot in
view of the cancellation of the corresponding claim.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating:

20 In claim 13: "wherein said first module requests
access to transmit data on said message bus using said
first signal line and transmits a bit of each of a
plurality of packets on said first signal line" is
25 ambiguous in that it's not clear whether it is "data"
transmitting that will be "using said first signal line" or
it is the "access to transmit" request that will be "using
said first signal line." The disclosure and the other
independent claim seem to imply the latter possible
30 interpretation, however both possible interpretations are
apparently consistent with the disclosure. The examiner
presumes here that latter interpretation is intended, and
accordingly the above-cited passage apparently should read
as "wherein said first module uses said first signal line
35 to request access to transmit data on said message bus and
also transmits a bit of each of a plurality of packets on
said first signal line" or the like, to remove the
ambiguity.

40 In response, claim 13 is sought to be amended to clarify that the first signal line is used by
the first module to both request access to the message bus and also to transmit a bit of the
packets.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as against claim 13 is respectfully

requested.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating:

5 In claim 21: "asserting" apparently should be
"asserts" and "said uncorrectable error" apparently should
be "an uncorrectable error" as the error need not
necessarily affect the same bits.

10 Claim 21 is sought to be amended accordingly. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35
U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

All the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are thus believed to be overcome. The Examiner
is thanked for the detailed examination.

15 ***Allowable Subject Matter***

In paragraph 11 on page 8 of the Outstanding Office Action, it was stated that Claims 5-
11 and 14-21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the outstanding rejections under 35
U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any
intervening claims.

20 Independent claim 1 is sought to be amended to include all the features of claim 5 and the
intervening claims. It is accordingly believed that currently amended claim 1 is in condition for
allowance.

25 Independent claim 13 is sought to be amended to include all the features of claim 14. It
is accordingly believed that currently amended claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

30 All the independent claims are thus in condition for allowance. The dependent claims are
also in condition for allowance as overcoming all the rejections/objections of record and
depending from an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

Thus, all the objections and rejections are believed to be overcome and the application is
believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned

representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra R Thappeta/

Signature

Date: January 24, 2011

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416